



# THE WEEKLY CLOSER

U.S. SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE  
MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 2006

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 11

## THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Inhofe Blasts Carper Bill](#)

## IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- [First CCSP Report Published With Further Evidence That It Is Biased \(Roger A. Pielke, Sr., Climate Science Blog\)](#)
- [Fight Over Gas Terminal May Go a Bridge Too Far \(The Hill Newspaper\)](#)
- [Seeing Red Over 'Green Scare' \(Jonah Goldberg, The Los Angeles Times\)](#)

## EPW RESOURCES

- [Majority Press Releases](#)
- [Speeches](#)
- [Fact of the Day Archive](#)
- [Weekly Closer Archive](#)
- [Schedule](#)
- [Past Hearings](#)
- [Multimedia](#)

## QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

"It amazes me that Senator Carper would introduce legislation that would significantly raise the cost of energy in the same week Senators are racing to find ways to reduce high fuel prices. Passage of this bill will cause a significant average price jump in natural gas, as well as price spikes. Undoubtedly, if enacted, this bill would place an even greater strain on the pocketbooks of American families as they struggle to pay their natural gas heating bills in the winter months."

Senator James M. Inhofe  
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works  
Statement on May 3, 2006

## INHOFE BLASTS CARPER BILL

Chairman Inhofe on Wednesday blasted legislation introduced by Senator Carper called the "Clean Air Planning Act." For the past year, Chairman Inhofe and Senator Voinovich have awaited a credible counter-offer from Senator Carper and other Committee Democrats to multiple proposals made by EPW Republicans during the Clear Skies negotiations last year.

"This is a step backward, not forward. Opponents continue to show they have no interest in a compromise by further tightening emissions cuts, eliminating needed reforms, and shortening the timelines for compliance. It's a shame they wasted another year and the extensive efforts of EPA's modelers in analyzing various proposals.

"A year after Senator Voinovich and I offered successive proposals moving to the center, Senator Carper today introduced legislation moving even farther to the left than his previous clean air bill. This is no way to negotiate. With this bill, Senator Carper continues to choose to place politics above our nation's public health and energy supply.

"The Clean Air Planning Act is a coal killer that will cause massive fuel switching from coal to an already overburdened natural gas supply. It amazes me that Senator Carper would introduce legislation that would significantly raise the cost of energy in the same week Senators are racing to find ways to reduce high fuel prices. Passage of this bill will cause a significant average price jump in natural gas, as well as price spikes. Undoubtedly, if enacted, this bill would place an even greater strain on the pocketbooks of American families as they struggle to pay their natural gas heating bills in the winter months.

“Senator Carper’s latest proposal goes further on regulating carbon dioxide than his previous version, yet the Senate has clearly spoken against mandatory carbon caps – most recently, in a bipartisan 30-68 vote last summer against McCain-Lieberman. This shows that today’s version of the Carper bill is not a serious attempt at compromise.

“Senator Voinovich and I continue to wait for a credible counteroffer by Senate Democrats so that we can provide a clean air victory for the American people.”

[Return to the top](#) 

## IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

### Climate Science Blog

#### First CCSP Report Published With Further Evidence That It Is Biased

Roger A. Pielke Sr.  
State Climatologist and Professor  
Department of Atmospheric Science  
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado  
M.S., Ph.D., Meteorology, Pennsylvania State University, 1969, 1973

May 2, 2006

The CCSP Report “[Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences](#)” by Thomas R. Karl, Susan J. Hassol, Christopher D. Miller, and William L. Murray, editors was published May 2 2006. This is a report by the Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research, Washington, DC.

As discussed several times on the Climate Science weblog and in my Public Comment, this Report is not a balanced presentation of the issue of recent surface and tropospheric temperature trends. The weblogs on this Report which report on its obvious conflict of interest include;

[Conflict of Interest in the CCSP Report “Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences”](#)  
[CCSP Report and Response to Public Comments Appears - Confirmation of the Advocacy Position of the Committee](#)  
[A Further Discussion of the Conflict of Interest on the CCSP Committee](#)

My Public Comment is available from

Pielke Sr., Roger A., 2005: [Public Comment](#) on CCSP Report “Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences”. 88 pp including appendices.

As another example of the advocacy character of the Report, one of the Editors, Ms. Susan Hassol, was also the writer of the recent HBO Special “To Hot Not to Handle”. This show clearly has a specific perspective on the climate change issue, and lacks a balanced perspective. The Executive Producer was Ms. Laurie David.

The synopsis of the show from the HBO web site states,

“Over the past century, consumption of carbon dioxide-emitting fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas) has risen to staggering levels, especially in the United States, where five percent of the world’s population is responsible for 25 percent of the world’s carbon dioxide emissions. TOO HOT NOT TO HANDLE offers a wealth of chilling evidence that the greenhouse effect is intensifying and the Earth is warming faster than at any other time in human history.

Among the startling facts revealed are:

Deadly heat waves in the U.S. have increased threefold since 1950 and today kill more people than hurricanes, tornadoes, lightning and blizzards combined.

The average temperature in Alaska has already risen five degrees, causing 99 percent of its glaciers to be melting, retreating and shrinking.

Rising sea levels are eroding our shoreline and may eventually displace large numbers of Americans.

The intensity of catastrophic storms, such as 2005’s devastating hurricanes Katrina and Rita, , has increased dramatically in the last half-century, as hurricanes draw their strength from warm ocean water.

Deadly viruses like West Nile, aided by higher air temperatures, are spreading to new parts of the globe, including the entire continental U.S.

‘My personal hope is that every viewer will be inspired to become part of the solution to reducing our carbon emissions,’ says executive producer Laurie David. “As the film shows, everything we need to address this pressing problem already exists, and the time to act is now.’ ”

The advocacy that is obvious in this HBO show is that these problems are due to the increased radiative forcing of added anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub>. As readers of this weblog know, the climate system, including the human influence, is much more complex than presented on the HBO show.

That one of the Editors of the CCSP Report also wrote the HBO special should be of concern regarding the objectivity of that Report. Ms. Hassol’s role as an advocate is clearly exemplified by her Nature correspondence in 1998 entitled “Clear need to act on global warming”.

Her role as advocate is, of course, appropriate, in other venues outside of the CCSP process. Her position at the Aspen Global Change Institute provides her with a platform to promote her views.

However, to serve as an Editor on the CCSP Report that was just published, with a documented active role in what text was to be included on the issue of “Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences”, further compromised the Report. Since the goal was to provide policymakers with an objective understanding of this issue in climate science, her involvement with the CCSP Report is yet another example to show that the Report was intended to promote a particular, narrow perspective on the issue of recent surface and tropospheric temperature trends.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the blog entry.

[Return to the top](#) 

## The Hill

### Business and Lobbying

## Fight Over Gas Terminal May Go a Bridge Too Far

May 3, 2006

By Jim Snyder

Massachusetts members thought they found a way to block a liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminal from being built in Fall River: Slip language into a massive transportation bill to prevent the planned destruction of an old bridge.

The Brightman Street Bridge, which spans the Taunton River, stood in the path that tankers carrying the supercooled natural gas would have to travel to reach the terminal. Because the drawbridge is relatively narrow, the tankers would not be able to pass through it. Save the bridge, kill the terminal, the members thought. They included \$500,000 to convert the bridge for bicycle and pedestrian use.

But Weaver’s Cove Energy, the company developing the project, had an answer. The company proposed shipping the gas in smaller tankers that would operate more frequently to meet demand.

After approving the terminal last July, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) reaffirmed that decision this year, taking into consideration the use of smaller tankers, even though the Coast Guard raised concerns about the more frequent traffic from the use of smaller ships...

The Weaver’s Cove case “showcases the lengths opponents will go to stop a project,” House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Joe Barton (R-Texas) said during a hearing last October according to a fact sheet distributed by Ogilvy Public Relations, which is working for the energy company.

Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), who as chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee played a key role in crafting the massive transportation reauthorization bill that served as a vehicle to block the Brightman Street Bridge demolition, introduced an amendment to rescind the

provision during debate on emergency heating funds.

In a floor speech, Inhofe said he was astonished to discover the provision had been slipped in.

"This short-sighted stunt by a few members means that the Northeast region will be deprived of supply that would reduce wholesale natural-gas prices by up to 20 percent," Inhofe said. The amendment was ruled out of order.

Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) noted opposition to the Weaver's Cove LNG terminal in a recent statement that criticized Democrats for embracing policies that lead to high energy prices.

Mershon said that Massachusetts members realize the state and region could use more natural gas but that the delegation thinks the terminals should be built offshore, away from population centers. The terminal could undermine economic development plans along the riverfront, Mershon said...

Company officials have noted that the terminal would be built in what was once a tank farm operated by Shell Oil Co. The company chose the site for that reason as well as its deepwater port and its proximity to a large natural-gas pipeline, according to a fact sheet distributed by Ogilvy.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the article.

[Return to the top](#) 

## The Los Angeles Times

### Seeing Red Over 'Green Scare'

**Jonah Goldberg**

**April 20, 2006**

MEET AL GORE, scaremonger. In 2004, Gore denounced President Bush for "playing on our fears." Today, he is at the forefront of a "green scare" about global warming intended to terrify Americans into submitting to his environmental policies.

Consider the trailer for "An Inconvenient Truth," Davis Guggenheim's documentary about Gore's green crusade. It promises to be the most adept piece of scaremongering ever captured on film, making "The Texas Chainsaw Massacre" seem like "Toy Story 2." The movie's poster shows penguins walking across a desert. The trailer says, "If you love your planet ... if you love your children ... you have to see this movie." In case you're thick in the head, the producers spell it out for you: "By far, the most terrifying film you will ever see!"

Of course, Gore is not alone. A host of new environmental scare books are out or on the way. Last month, Time magazine's cover warned, "Be Worried. Be Very Worried." Those renowned climatologists who make up Vanity Fair's

editorial board have unveiled a "green issue" that informs us that "green is the new black" and that global warming is a "threat graver than terrorism." It says so right there on the cover, above Julia Roberts' hip. And she's dressed like a forest nymph, so it's got to be true...

But it's also true that we don't have a clear picture of what's happening now, never mind what will happen. Just ask the 60 climatologists from around the world who wrote Canada's prime minister that "observational evidence does not support today's computer climate models, so there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future." But that's all beside the point to Gore & Co., who say the time for debate is over. And if you disagree, get ready for the witch hunt. Major news media have gone after scientists who argue there's still time to study global warming rather than plunge into some half-baked environmental jihad that could waste possibly trillions of dollars...

In Vanity Fair, writer Mark Hertsgaard alleges that Frederick Seitz, the former president of the National Academy of Sciences and the former president of the prestigious Rockefeller University, was a shill for, of all things, the tobacco industry. A press release by the National Environmental Trust proclaims "Scientist Who Spearheaded Attacks on Global Warming Also Directed \$45M Tobacco Industry Effort to Hide Health Impacts of Smoking." Seitz, a giant in American science, says this is all "ridiculous, completely wrong." Now 94, Seitz explained to TCSDaily.com that R.J. Reynolds had given Rockefeller University \$5 million a year for basic research. Seitz says he directed the money toward non-tobacco-related efforts in the study of prions (the virus-like proteins that cause mad cow disease), tuberculosis and other diseases. Prion researcher Stanley Prusiner thanked both R.J. Reynolds and Seitz in his Nobel Prize acceptance speech.

But Gore & Co. aren't troubled by such details because the smears are all for a good cause. That's why Gore saw nothing wrong in bullying dissident climate change scientists when he was a senator or waging a mean-spirited campaign to discredit the work of his old mentor, Harvard oceanographer Roger Revelle, because Revelle thought alarmism was unwarranted.

Hence the irony of the title "An Inconvenient Truth." It is the green scare that has no patience for inconvenient truths. For example, Gore blames the disappearing snows of Mt. Kilimanjaro on global warming, but a 2003 study in Nature identified the clear-cutting of surrounding moisture-rich forests as the culprit. In the famously fact-checked New Yorker, Editor David Remnick pens a love letter to Gore in which he laments that Earth will "likely be an uninhabitable planet" if we don't heed Gore's jeremiads. Oh ... come ... on!...

But none of that seems to matter to the greens. To them, the only thing we have to fear is the lack of fear itself.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the article.

[Return to the top](#) 

---

Matthew Dempsey, Press Secretary

